

Upper Triangular Operator Matrices, SVEP and Browder, Weyl Theorems

B. P. Duggal

Abstract

A Banach space operator $T \in B(\mathcal{X})$ is polaroid if points $\lambda \in \text{iso}\sigma(T)$ are poles of the resolvent of T . Let $\sigma_a(T)$, $\sigma_w(T)$, $\sigma_{aw}(T)$, $\sigma_{SF_+}(T)$ and $\sigma_{SF_-}(T)$ denote, respectively, the approximate point, the Weyl, the Weyl essential approximate, the upper semi-Fredholm and lower semi-Fredholm spectrum of T . For A , B and $C \in B(\mathcal{X})$, let M_C denote the operator matrix $\begin{pmatrix} A & C \\ 0 & B \end{pmatrix}$. If A is polaroid on $\pi_0(M_C) = \{\lambda \in \text{iso}\sigma(M_C) : 0 < \dim(M_C - \lambda)^{-1}(0) < \infty\}$, M_0 satisfies Weyl's theorem, and A and B satisfy either of the hypotheses (i) A has SVEP at points $\lambda \in \sigma_w(M_0) \setminus \sigma_{SF_+}(A)$ and B has SVEP at points $\mu \in \sigma_w(M_0) \setminus \sigma_{SF_-}(B)$, or, (ii) both A and A^* have SVEP at points $\lambda \in \sigma_w(M_0) \setminus \sigma_{SF_+}(A)$, or, (iii) A^* has SVEP at points $\lambda \in \sigma_w(M_0) \setminus \sigma_{SF_+}(A)$ and B^* has SVEP at points $\mu \in \sigma_w(M_0) \setminus \sigma_{SF_-}(B)$, then $\sigma(M_C) \setminus \sigma_w(M_C) = \pi_0(M_C)$. Here the hypothesis that $\lambda \in \pi_0(M_C)$ are poles of the resolvent of A can not be replaced by the hypothesis $\lambda \in \pi_0(A)$ are poles of the resolvent of A .

For an operator $T \in B(\mathcal{X})$, let $\pi_0^a(T) = \{\lambda : \lambda \in \text{iso}\sigma_a(T), 0 < \dim(T - \lambda)^{-1}(0) < \infty\}$. We prove that if A^* and B^* have SVEP, A is polaroid on $\pi_0^a(M_C)$ and B is polaroid on $\pi_0^a(B)$, then $\sigma_a(M_C) \setminus \sigma_{aw}(M_C) = \pi_0^a(M_C)$.

1 Introduction

A Banach space operator A , $A \in B(\mathcal{X})$, is upper semi-Fredholm (resp., lower semi-Fredholm) at a complex number $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ if the range $(A - \lambda)\mathcal{X}$ is closed and $\alpha(A - \lambda) = \dim(A - \lambda)^{-1}(0) < \infty$ (resp., $\beta(A - \lambda) = \dim(\mathcal{X}/(A - \lambda)\mathcal{X}) < \infty$). Let $\lambda \in \Phi_+(A)$ (resp., $\lambda \in \Phi_-(A)$) denote that A is upper semi-Fredholm (resp., lower semi-Fredholm) at λ . The operator A is Fredholm at λ , denoted $\lambda \in \Phi(A)$, if $\lambda \in \Phi_+(A) \cap \Phi_-(A)$. A is Browder (resp., Weyl) at λ if $\lambda \in \Phi(A)$ and $\text{asc}(A - \lambda) = \text{dsc}(A - \lambda) < \infty$ (resp., if

AMS(MOS) subject classification (2000). Primary 47B47, 47A10, 47A11

Key words and phrases. Banach space, operator matrix, Browder spectrum, Weyl spectrum, single valued extension property, polaroid operator Browder and Weyl theorems.

$\lambda \in \Phi(A)$ and $\text{ind}(A - \lambda) = 0$). Here $\text{ind}(A - \lambda) = \alpha(A - \lambda) - \beta(A - \lambda)$ denotes the Fredholm index of $A - \lambda$, $\text{asc}(A - \lambda)$ denotes the ascent of $A - \lambda$ (= the least non-negative integer n such that $(A - \lambda)^{-n}(0) = (A - \lambda)^{-(n+1)}(0)$) and $\text{dsc}(A - \lambda)$ denotes the descent of $A - \lambda$ (= the least non-negative integer n such that $(A - \lambda)^n \mathcal{X} = (A - \lambda)^{n+1} \mathcal{X}$). Let $\sigma(A)$ denote the spectrum, $\sigma_a(A)$ the approximate point spectrum, $\text{iso}\sigma(A)$ the set of isolated points of $\sigma(A)$, $\pi_0(A) = \{\lambda \in \text{iso}\sigma(A) : 0 < \alpha(A - \lambda) < \infty\}$, $\pi_0^a(A) = \{\lambda \in \text{iso}\sigma_a(A) : 0 < \alpha(A - \lambda) < \infty\}$, and $p_0(A)$ the set of finite rank poles (of the resolvent) of A . The Browder spectrum $\sigma_b(A)$ of A is the set $\{\lambda \in \mathbb{C} : A - \lambda \text{ is not Browder}\}$, the Weyl spectrum $\sigma_w(A)$ of A is the set $\{\lambda \in \mathbb{C} : A - \lambda \text{ is not Weyl}\}$, the Browder essential approximate spectrum $\sigma_{ab}(A)$ of A is the set $\{\lambda \in \mathbb{C} : \lambda \notin \Phi_+(A) \text{ or } \text{asc}(A - \lambda) \not\leq \infty\}$, and the Weyl essential approximate spectrum $\sigma_{aw}(A)$ of A is the set $\{\lambda \in \mathbb{C} : \lambda \notin \Phi_+(A) \text{ or } \text{ind}(A - \lambda) \not\leq 0\}$. Following current terminology, the operator A satisfies: Browder's theorem, or *Bt*, if $\sigma_w(A) = \sigma_b(A)$ (equivalently, $\sigma(A) \setminus \sigma_w(A) = p_0(A)$); Weyl's theorem, or *Wt*, if $\sigma(A) \setminus \sigma_w(A) = \pi_0(A)$; *a*-Browder's theorem, or *a-Bt*, if $\sigma_{aw}(A) = \sigma_{ab}(A)$; *a*-Weyl's theorem, or *a-Wt*, if $\sigma_a(A) \setminus \sigma_{aw}(A) = \pi_0^a(A)$.

An operator $A \in B(\mathcal{X})$ has *the single-valued extension property* at $\lambda_0 \in \mathbb{C}$, SVEP at λ_0 , if for every open disc $\mathcal{D}_{\lambda_0}$ centered at λ_0 the only analytic function $f : \mathcal{D}_{\lambda_0} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ which satisfies

$$(A - \lambda)f(\lambda) = 0 \quad \text{for all } \lambda \in \mathcal{D}_{\lambda_0}$$

is the function $f \equiv 0$. Trivially, every operator A has SVEP on the resolvent set $\rho(A) = \mathbb{C} \setminus \sigma(A)$; also A has SVEP at points $\lambda \in \text{iso}\sigma(A)$. Let $\Xi(A)$ denote the set of $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ where A does not have SVEP: we say that A has SVEP if $\Xi(A) = \emptyset$. SVEP plays an important role in determining the relationship between the Browder and Weyl spectra, and the Browder and Weyl theorems. Thus $\sigma_b(A) = \sigma_w(A) \cup \Xi(A) = \sigma_w(A) \cup \Xi(A^*)$, and if A^* has SVEP then $\sigma_b(A) = \sigma_w(A) = \sigma_{ab}(A)$ [1, pp 141-142]; A satisfies *Bt* (resp., *a-Bt*) if and only if A has SVEP at $\lambda \notin \sigma_w(A)$ (resp., $\lambda \notin \sigma_{aw}(A)$) [5, Lemma 2.18]; and if A^* has SVEP, then A satisfies *Wt* implies A satisfies *a-Wt* [1, Theorem 3.108].

For A, B and $C \in B(\mathcal{X})$, let M_C denote the upper triangular operator matrix $M_C = \begin{pmatrix} A & C \\ 0 & B \end{pmatrix}$. A study of the spectrum, the Browder and Weyl spectra, and the Browder and Weyl theorems for the operator M_C , and the related diagonal operator $M_0 = A \oplus B$, has been carried by a number of authors in the recent past (see [2, 3, 4, 8] for further references). Thus, if either $\Xi(A^*) = \emptyset$ or $\Xi(B) = \emptyset$, then $\sigma(M_C) = \sigma(M_0) = \sigma(A) \cup \sigma(B)$; if $\Xi(A) \cup \Xi(B) = \emptyset$, then M_C has SVEP, $\sigma_b(M_C) = \sigma_w(M_C) = \sigma_b(M_0) = \sigma_w(M_0)$, and M_C satisfies *a-Bt*. Browder's theorem, much less Weyl's theorem, does not transfer from individual operators to direct sums: for example, the forward unilateral shift and the backward unilateral shift on a Hilbert space satisfy *Bt*, but their direct sum does not. However, if $(\Xi(A) \cap \Xi(B^*)) \cup \Xi(A^*) = \emptyset$, then M_0 satisfies

Bt (resp., $a - Bt$) implies M_C satisfies Bt (resp., $a - Bt$); if points $\lambda \in \text{iso}\sigma(A)$ are eigenvalues of A , A satisfies Wt , then M_0 satisfies Wt implies M_C satisfies Wt [4, Proposition 4.1 and Theorem 4.2]. Our aim in this paper is to fine tune some of the extant results to prove that: $\sigma_b(M_0) = \sigma_b(M_C) \cup \{\Xi(A^*) \cap \Xi(B)\}$; $\sigma_{ab}(M_C) \subseteq \sigma_{ab}(M_0) \subseteq \sigma_{ab}(M_C) \cup \Xi_+^*(A) \cup \Xi_+(B)$; and $\sigma_w(A) \cup \sigma_w(B) \subseteq \sigma_w(M_C) \cup \{\Xi(P) \cup \Xi(Q)\}$, where, except for $P = A$ and $Q = B^*$, $P = A$ or A^* and $Q = B$ or B^* , $\Xi_+^*(A) = \{\lambda : \lambda \notin \Phi_+(A) \text{ or } A^* \text{ does not have SVEP at } \lambda\}$ and $\Xi_+(B) = \{\lambda : \lambda \notin \Phi_+(B) \text{ or } B \text{ does not have SVEP at } \lambda\}$. Let $\sigma_{SF_+}(A)$ (resp., $\sigma_{SF_-}(A)$) denote the *upper semi-Fredholm spectrum* (resp., *lower semi-Fredholm spectrum*) of A . It is proved that if points $\lambda \in \pi_0(M_C)$ are poles of A , M_0 satisfies Wt , and A and B satisfy either of the hypotheses (i) A has SVEP at points $\lambda \in \sigma_w(M_0) \setminus \sigma_{SF_+}(A)$ and B has SVEP at points $\mu \in \sigma_w(M_0) \setminus \sigma_{SF_-}(B)$ or both A and A^* have SVEP at points $\lambda \in \sigma_w(M_0) \setminus \sigma_{SF_+}(A)$ or A^* has SVEP at points $\lambda \in \sigma_w(M_0) \setminus \sigma_{SF_+}(A)$ and B^* has SVEP at points $\mu \in \sigma_w(M_0) \setminus \sigma_{SF_-}(B)$, then M_C satisfies Wt . Here the hypothesis that points $\lambda \in \pi_0(M_C)$ are poles of A is essential. We prove also that if $\Xi(A^*) \cup \Xi(B^*) = \emptyset$, points $\lambda \in \pi_0^a(M_C)$ are poles of A and points $\mu \in \pi_0^a(B)$ are poles of B , then M_C satisfies $a - Wt$.

Throughout the following, the operators A , B and C shall be as in the operator matrix M_C ; we shall write $T \in B(\mathcal{Y})$ for a general Banach space operator.

2 Browder, Weyl Spectra and SVEP

We start by recalling some results which will be used in the sequel without further reference.

For an operator $T \in B(\mathcal{Y})$ such that $\lambda \in \Phi_{\pm}(T)$, the following statements are equivalent [1, Theorems 3.16 and 3.17]:

- (a) T (resp., T^*) has SVEP at λ ;
- (b) $\text{asc}(T - \lambda) < \infty$ (resp., $\text{dsc}(T - \lambda) < \infty$).

Furthermore, if $\lambda \in \Phi_{\pm}(T)$, and both T and T^* have SVEP at λ , then $\text{asc}(T - \lambda) = \text{dsc}(T - \lambda) < \infty$, $\lambda \in \text{iso}\sigma(T)$ and λ is a pole of (the resolvent of) T [1, Corollary 3.21]. For an operator $T \in B(\mathcal{Y})$ such that $\lambda \in \Phi(T)$ with $\text{ind}(T - \lambda) = 0$, T or T^* has SVEP at λ if and only if $\text{asc}(T - \lambda) = \text{dsc}(T - \lambda) < \infty$. Evidently, $\text{asc}(M_C) < \infty \implies \text{asc}(A) < \infty$. It is not difficult to verify, [4, Lemma 2.1], that $\text{dsc}(B) = \infty \implies \text{dsc}(M_C) = \infty$. In general,

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma(M_C) &\subseteq \sigma(A) \cup \sigma(B) = \sigma(M_0) = \sigma(M_C) \cup \{\Xi(A^*) \cup \Xi(B)\}; \\ \sigma_b(M_C) &\subseteq \sigma_b(A) \cup \sigma_b(B) = \sigma_b(M_0); \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\sigma_w(M_C) \subseteq \sigma_w(M_0) \subseteq \sigma_w(A) \cup \sigma_w(B).$$

If $\lambda \notin \sigma_{aw}(M_C)$, then $\lambda \in \Phi_+(A)$, and either $\alpha(B-\lambda) < \infty$ and $\text{ind}(A-\lambda) + \text{ind}(B-\lambda) \leq 0$, or $\beta(A-\lambda) = \alpha(B-\lambda) = \infty$ and $(B-\lambda)\mathcal{X}$ is closed, or $\beta(A-\lambda) = \infty$ and $(B-\lambda)\mathcal{X}$ is not closed [3, Theorem 4.6]. Since

$$M_C - \lambda = \begin{pmatrix} I & 0 \\ 0 & B - \lambda \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} I & C \\ 0 & I \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} A - \lambda & 0 \\ 0 & I \end{pmatrix},$$

$\lambda \in \Phi(M_C)$ implies that $\lambda \in \Phi_+(A) \cap \Phi_-(B)$. Using this it is seen that if $\lambda \notin \sigma_b(M_C)$, then $\lambda \in \Phi_+(A) \cap \Phi_-(B)$, $\text{ind}(A-\lambda) + \text{ind}(B-\lambda) = 0$, $\text{asc}(A-\lambda) < \infty$ and $\text{dsc}(B-\lambda) < \infty$. If in addition $\lambda \notin \Xi(P) \cup \Xi(Q)$, where (except for $P = A$ and $Q = B^*$) $P = A$ or A^* and $Q = B$ or B^* , then it is seen (argue as in the proof of Proposition 2.1 below) that $\text{ind}(A-\lambda) = \text{ind}(B-\lambda) = 0$. Thus $\lambda \notin \sigma_b(M_0)$, which implies that

$$\sigma_b(M_0) \subseteq \sigma_b(M_C) \cup \{\Xi(P) \cup \Xi(Q)\},$$

where, except for $P = A$ and $Q = B^*$, $P = A$ or A^* and $Q = B$ or B^* . The following proposition gives more.

Proposition 2.1 $\sigma_b(M_0) = \sigma_b(M_C) \cup \{\Xi(A^*) \cap \Xi(B)\}$.

Proof. If $\lambda \notin \sigma_b(M_0)$, then $\lambda \in \Phi(A) \cap \Phi(B)$, $\text{asc}(A-\lambda) = \text{dsc}(A-\lambda) < \infty$ and $\text{asc}(B-\lambda) = \text{dsc}(B-\lambda) < \infty$. Since $\text{dsc}(A-\lambda) \implies \lambda \notin \Xi(A^*)$ and $\text{asc}(B-\lambda) \implies \lambda \notin \Xi(B)$, $\lambda \notin \Xi(A^*) \cap \Xi(B)$. Hence, since $\sigma_b(M_C) \subseteq \sigma_b(M_0)$, $\lambda \notin \sigma_b(M_C) \cup \{\Xi(A^*) \cap \Xi(B)\}$. Conversely, if $\lambda \notin \sigma_b(M_C) \cup \{\Xi(A^*) \cap \Xi(B)\}$, then $\lambda \in \Phi_+(A) \cap \Phi_-(B)$, $\text{asc}(A-\lambda) < \infty$ ($\implies \text{ind}(A-\lambda) \leq 0$), $\text{dsc}(B-\lambda) < \infty$ ($\implies \text{ind}(B-\lambda) \geq 0$) and $\text{ind}(A-\lambda) + \text{ind}(B-\lambda) = 0$. If A^* has SVEP, then $\text{ind}(A-\lambda) \geq 0$; hence $\text{ind}(A-\lambda) = 0$, which implies that $\text{ind}(B-\lambda) = 0$. But then both $A-\lambda$ and $B-\lambda$ have finite (hence, equal) ascent and descent. Thus $\lambda \notin \sigma_b(M_0)$. Arguing similarly in the case in which $\lambda \notin \Xi(B)$ (this time using the fact that $\lambda \in \Phi_-(B)$, $\text{dsc}(B-\lambda) < \infty$ and $\lambda \notin \Xi(B)$ imply $\text{ind}(B-\lambda) = 0$), it is seen (once again) that $\lambda \notin \sigma_b(M_0)$. $\square$

If we let

$$\sigma_{sb}(T) = \{\lambda \in \mathbb{C} : \text{either } \lambda \notin \Phi_-(T) \text{ or } \text{dsc}(T-\lambda) = \infty\},$$

then $\sigma_{sb}(T) = \sigma_{ab}(T^*)$, $\sigma_b(T) = \sigma_{ab}(T) \cup \sigma_{sb}(T)$ and $\sigma_b(T) = \sigma_{ab}(T) \cup \Xi(T^*) = \sigma_{sb}(T) \cup \Xi(T)$ [1, p 141]. Evidently, $\sigma_{ab}(M_0) \cup \{\Xi(A^*) \cup \Xi(B^*)\} = \sigma_b(M_0)$. Let $\Xi_+(T)$ and $\Xi_+^*(T)$ denote the sets of λ such that

$$\lambda \notin \Xi_+(T) \implies \lambda \in \Phi_+(T) \text{ and } T \text{ has SVEP at } \lambda$$

and

$$\lambda \notin \Xi_+^*(T) \implies \lambda \in \Phi_+(T) \text{ and } T^* \text{ has SVEP at } \lambda.$$

Proposition 2.2 $\sigma_{ab}(M_C) \subseteq \sigma_{ab}(M_0) \subseteq \sigma_{ab}(M_C) \cup \{\Xi_+^*(A) \cup \Xi_+(B)\}$.

Proof. The inclusion $\sigma_{ab}(M_C) \subseteq \sigma_{ab}(M_0)$ being evident, we prove $\sigma_{ab}(M_0) \subseteq \sigma_{ab}(M_C) \cup \Xi_+^*(A)$. Let $\lambda \notin \sigma_{ab}(M_C) \cup \Xi_+^*(A)$. Then $\lambda \in \Phi_+(A)$, $\text{asc}(A - \lambda) < \infty$, and A^* has SVEP at λ . Hence $\text{ind}(A - \lambda) = 0$ and $\lambda \in \Phi(A)$ ($\implies \lambda \notin \sigma_{ab}(A)$), which implies that $\lambda \in \Phi_+(B)$ and $\text{ind}(B - \lambda) \leq 0$ (since $\text{asc}(M_C - \lambda) < \infty \implies \text{ind}(A - \lambda) + \text{ind}(B - \lambda) \leq 0$). But then the hypothesis $\lambda \notin \Xi_+(B)$ implies that $\lambda \notin \sigma_{ab}(B) \implies \lambda \notin \sigma_{ab}(M_0)$. $\square$

The following corollary is immediate from Proposition 2.2.

Corollary 2.3 *If $\Xi_+^*(A) \cup \Xi_+(B) = \emptyset$, then $\sigma_{ab}(M_0) = \sigma_{ab}(M_C)$.*

It is easy to see (from the definitions of $\sigma_b(T)$ and $\sigma_w(T)$) that

$$\sigma_b(T) = \sigma_w(T) \cup \Xi(T) = \sigma_w(T) \cup \Xi(T^*).$$

Hence

$$\sigma_b(M_0) = \{\sigma_w(A) \cup \sigma_w(B)\} \cup \{\Xi(P) \cup \Xi(Q)\},$$

where $P = A$ or A^* and $Q = B$ or B^* .

Proposition 2.4 $\sigma_w(A) \cup \sigma_w(B) \subseteq \sigma_w(M_C) \cup \{\Xi(P) \cup \Xi(Q)\}$, where $P = A$ and $Q = B$ or $P = A^*$ and $Q = B^*$.

Proof. The proof in both the cases is similar: we consider $P = A$ and $Q = B$. If $\lambda \notin \sigma_w(M_C)$, then $\lambda \in \Phi_+(A) \cap \Phi_-(B)$ and $\text{ind}(A - \lambda) + \text{ind}(B - \lambda) = 0$. Thus, since $\lambda \notin \Xi(A) \cup \Xi(B)$ implies $\text{ind}(A - \lambda) \leq 0$ and $\text{ind}(B - \lambda) \leq 0$, $\text{ind}(A - \lambda) = \text{ind}(B - \lambda) = 0$ and $\lambda \in \Phi(A) \cap \Phi(B)$. Hence $\lambda \notin \sigma_w(A) \cup \sigma_w(B)$. $\square$

Proposition 2.4 implies that if $\Xi(P) \cup \Xi(Q) = \emptyset$, P and Q as above, then $\sigma_w(M_0) = \sigma_w(M_C) = \sigma_w(A) \cup \sigma_w(B)$. More is true. Since $\lambda \notin \sigma_w(M_C) \cup \{\Xi(P) \cup \Xi(Q)\}$ implies $\lambda \in \Phi(A) \cap \Phi(B)$ and $\text{ind}(A - \lambda) = \text{ind}(B - \lambda) = 0$, $\text{asc}(A - \lambda) = \text{dsc}(A - \lambda) < \infty$ and $\text{asc}(B - \lambda) = \text{dsc}(B - \lambda) < \infty$. Hence $\sigma_b(M_C) \subseteq \sigma_w(M_C) \cup \{\Xi(P) \cup \Xi(Q)\}$.

Corollary 2.5 *If $\Xi(P) \cup \Xi(Q) = \emptyset$, P and Q as in Proposition 2.4, then $\sigma_b(M_0) = \sigma_w(M_0) = \sigma_b(M_C) = \sigma_w(M_C) = \sigma_w(A) \cup \sigma_w(B)$.*

Proof. $\sigma_w(M_C) \subseteq \sigma_b(M_C) \subseteq \sigma_b(M_0)$. $\square$

The following theorem gives a necessary and sufficient condition for $\sigma_w(M_0) = \sigma_b(M_0)$ and $\sigma_{aw}(M_0) = \sigma_{ab}(M_0)$.

Theorem 2.6 (i) $\sigma_w(M_0) = \sigma_b(M_0)$ if and only if A and B have SVEP on $\{\lambda : \lambda \in \Phi(A) \cap \Phi(B), \text{ind}(A - \lambda) + \text{ind}(B - \lambda) = 0\}$.

(ii) $\sigma_{aw}(M_0) = \sigma_{ab}(M_0)$ if and only if A and B have SVEP on $\{\lambda : \lambda \in \Phi_+(A) \cap \Phi_+(B), \text{ind}(A - \lambda) + \text{ind}(B - \lambda) \leq 0\}$.

Proof. (i) If $\sigma_w(M_0) = \sigma_b(M_0)$, then $\sigma_w(M_0) = \sigma_w(A) \cup \sigma_w(B) = \sigma_b(A) \cup \sigma_b(B)$. Hence $\lambda \in \Phi(A) \cap \Phi(B)$ with $\text{ind}(A - \lambda) = \text{ind}(B - \lambda) = 0$ if and only if $\lambda \in \Phi(A) \cap \Phi(B)$, $\text{asc}(A - \lambda) = \text{dsc}(A - \lambda) < \infty$ and $\text{asc}(B - \lambda) = \text{dsc}(B - \lambda) < \infty$. Evidently, A and B have SVEP at points $\{\lambda : \lambda \in \Phi(A) \cap \Phi(B), \text{ind}(A - \lambda) + \text{ind}(B - \lambda) = 0\}$. Conversely, if $\lambda \notin \sigma_w(M_0)$, then $\lambda \in \Phi(A) \cap \Phi(B)$ and $\text{ind}(A - \lambda) + \text{ind}(B - \lambda) = 0$. Since A and B have SVEP at λ , $\text{ind}(A - \lambda)$ and $\text{ind}(B - \lambda)$ are both ≤ 0 . Hence $\text{ind}(A - \lambda) = \text{ind}(B - \lambda) = 0$, which (because of SVEP) implies that $\text{asc}(A - \lambda) = \text{dsc}(A - \lambda) < \infty$ and $\text{asc}(B - \lambda) = \text{dsc}(B - \lambda) < \infty$. Thus $\lambda \notin \sigma_b(A) \cup \sigma_b(B) \implies \sigma_b(M_0) \subseteq \sigma_w(M_0)$. Since $\sigma_w(M_0) \subseteq \sigma_b(M_0)$ always, $\sigma_w(M_0) = \sigma_b(M_0)$.

(ii) Since $\sigma_{aw}(M_0) \subseteq \sigma_{aw}(A) \cup \sigma_{aw}(B) \subseteq \sigma_{ab}(A) \cup \sigma_{ab}(B) = \sigma_{ab}(M_0)$, $\sigma_{aw}(M_0) = \sigma_{ab}(M_0)$ implies that $\sigma_{aw}(M_0) = \sigma_{ab}(A) \cup \sigma_{ab}(B)$. Equivalently,

$$\begin{aligned} & \{\lambda : \lambda \in \Phi_+(A) \cap \Phi_+(B), \text{ind}(A - \lambda) + \text{ind}(B - \lambda) \leq 0\} \\ &= \{\lambda : \lambda \in \Phi_+(A) \cap \Phi_+(B), \text{asc}(A - \lambda) < \infty, \text{asc}(B - \lambda) < \infty\}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence A and B have SVEP on $\{\lambda : \lambda \in \Phi_+(A) \cap \Phi_+(B), \text{ind}(A - \lambda) + \text{ind}(B - \lambda) \leq 0\}$. Conversely, if $\lambda \notin \sigma_{aw}(M_0)$, then $\lambda \in \Phi_+(A) \cap \Phi_+(B)$ and $\text{ind}(A - \lambda) + \text{ind}(B - \lambda) \leq 0$. Since A and B have SVEP at λ , both $\text{asc}(A - \lambda)$ and $\text{asc}(B - \lambda)$ are finite. Hence $\lambda \notin \sigma_{ab}(A) \cup \sigma_{ab}(B)$, which implies that $\lambda \notin \sigma_{ab}(M_0) \implies \sigma_{ab}(M_0) \subseteq \sigma_{aw}(M_0)$. Since $\sigma_{aw}(M_0) \subseteq \sigma_{ab}(M_0)$ always, the proof is complete. $\square$

3 Browder, Weyl Theorems

Translating Theorem 2.6 to the terminology of Browder's theorem, Bt , and a -Browder's theorem, $a - Bt$, we see that *a necessary and sufficient condition for M_0 to satisfy Bt is that A and B have SVEP at points $\lambda \notin \sigma_w(M_0)$, and that a necessary and sufficient condition for M_0 to satisfy $a - Bt$ is that A and B have SVEP at points $\lambda \notin \sigma_{aw}(M_0)$* . The following theorem relates Bt (resp., $a - Bt$) for M_0 to Bt (resp., $a - Bt$) for M_C . Let $\sigma_{SF_+}(T)$ (resp., $\sigma_{SF_-}(T)$) denote the *upper semi-Fredholm spectrum* (resp., the *lower semi-Fredholm spectrum*) of T .

Theorem 3.1 (a). *If either (i) A has SVEP at points $\lambda \in \sigma_w(M_0) \setminus \sigma_{SF_+}(A)$ and B has SVEP at points $\mu \in \sigma_w(M_0) \setminus \sigma_{SF_-}(B)$, or (ii) both A and A^* have SVEP at points $\lambda \in \sigma_w(M_0) \setminus \sigma_{SF_+}(A)$, or (iii) A^* has SVEP at points $\lambda \in \sigma_w(M_0) \setminus \sigma_{SF_+}(A)$ and B^* has SVEP at points $\mu \in \sigma_w(M_0) \setminus \sigma_{SF_-}(B)$, then M_0 satisfies Bt implies M_C satisfies Bt .*

(b) *If either (i) A has SVEP at points $\lambda \in \sigma_{aw}(M_0) \setminus \sigma_{SF_+}(A)$ and A^* has SVEP at points $\mu \in \sigma_w(M_0) \setminus \sigma_{SF_+}(A)$, or (ii) A^* has SVEP at points $\lambda \in \sigma_w(M_0) \setminus \sigma_{SF_+}(A)$ and B^* has SVEP at points $\mu \in \sigma_w(M_0) \setminus \sigma_{SF_+}(B)$, then M_0 satisfies $a - Bt$ implies M_C satisfies $a - Bt$.*

Proof. (a) Recall that M_0 satisfies Bt if and only if M_0^* satisfies Bt , and that $\sigma_w(M_0^*) = \sigma_w(M_0)$. Hence A , B , A^* and B^* have SVEP at points $\lambda \notin \sigma_w(M_0)$. In view of this, hypotheses (i), (ii) and (iii) imply respectively that either (i)' A has SVEP at $\lambda \in \Phi_+(A)$ and B has SVEP at $\mu \in \Phi_-(B)$, or (ii)' A and A^* have SVEP at $\lambda \in \Phi_+(A)$, or (iii)' A^* has SVEP at $\lambda \in \Phi_+(A)$ and B^* has SVEP at $\mu \in \Phi_-(B)$. Evidently, $\sigma_w(M_C) \subseteq \sigma_b(M_C)$: we prove that $\sigma_b(M_C) \subseteq \sigma_w(M_C)$. For this, let $\lambda \notin \sigma_w(M_C)$. Then $\lambda \in \Phi_+(A) \cap \Phi_-(B)$ and $\text{ind}(A - \lambda) + \text{ind}(B - \lambda) = 0$. Since both $\text{ind}(A - \lambda)$ and $\text{ind}(B - \lambda)$ are ≤ 0 if (i)' holds, $\text{ind}(A - \lambda) = 0$ if (ii)' holds, and both $\text{ind}(A - \lambda)$ and $\text{ind}(B - \lambda)$ are ≥ 0 if (iii)' holds, we conclude that $\text{ind}(A - \lambda) = \text{ind}(B - \lambda) = 0$, $\lambda \in \Phi(A) \cap \Phi(B)$. Furthermore, since A and B have SVEP at λ , $\text{asc}(A - \lambda) = \text{dsc}(A - \lambda) < \infty$ and $\text{asc}(B - \lambda) = \text{dsc}(B - \lambda) < \infty$. Hence $\lambda \notin \sigma_b(A) \cup \sigma_b(B) \implies \lambda \notin \sigma_b(M_C)$.

(b) Since $a - Bt$ implies Bt , M_0^* satisfies Bt , which implies that A^* has SVEP at $\lambda \notin \sigma_w(M_0)$. Hence the hypothesis A^* has SVEP at $\lambda \in \sigma_w(M_0) \setminus \sigma_{SF_+}(A)$ implies that A^* has SVEP at $\lambda \in \Phi_+(A)$. Since the hypothesis M_0 satisfies $a - Bt$ implies that A and B have SVEP on $\{\lambda : \lambda \in \Phi_+(A) \cap \Phi_+(B), \text{ind}(A - \lambda) + \text{ind}(B - \lambda) \leq 0\}$, it follows from the SVEP hypotheses of the statement that either (i)' both A and A^* have SVEP at $\lambda \in \Phi_+(A)$ or (ii)' A^* has SVEP at $\lambda \in \Phi_+(A)$ and B^* has SVEP at $\mu \in \Phi_+(B)$. Evidently, $\sigma_{aw}(M_C) \subseteq \sigma_{ab}(M_C)$. For the reverse inclusion, let $\lambda \notin \sigma_{aw}(M_C)$. Then $\lambda \in \Phi_+(A)$. If (i)' is satisfied, then A and A^* have SVEP at $\lambda \implies \text{ind}(A - \lambda) = 0$, which (because $\lambda \in \Phi_+(A)$) implies that $\lambda \in \Phi(A)$ and $\text{ind}(A - \lambda) = 0$; if (ii)' holds, then A^* has SVEP at λ implies $\text{ind}(A - \lambda) \geq 0 \implies \lambda \in \Phi(A)$ with $\text{ind}(A - \lambda) \geq 0$. In either case it follows that $\lambda \in \Phi_+(B)$ and $\text{ind}(A - \lambda) + \text{ind}(B - \lambda) \leq 0$. Hence $\lambda \in \Phi(A) \cap \Phi(B)$, $\text{ind}(A - \lambda) = 0$ and $\text{ind}(B - \lambda) \leq 0$. Since both A and B have SVEP on $\{\lambda : \lambda \in \Phi_+(A) \cap \Phi_+(B), \text{ind}(A - \lambda) + \text{ind}(B - \lambda) \leq 0\}$, $\text{asc}(A - \lambda) < \infty$ and $\text{asc}(B - \lambda) < \infty$. Thus $\lambda \notin \sigma_{ab}(M_0) \implies \lambda \notin \sigma_{ab}(M_C)$. $\square$

Remark 3.2 We note, for future reference, that if M_0 satisfies Bt and either of the hypotheses (i) to (iii) of Theorem 3.1(a) is satisfied, then $\sigma_w(M_0) = \sigma_w(M_C)$. Furthermore, $\sigma(M_C) = \sigma(M_0)$, as the following argument shows. If M_0 satisfies Bt , and one of the hypotheses (i), (ii) and (iii) is satisfied, then either A^* has SVEP at $\lambda \in \Phi_+(A)$ or B has SVEP at $\mu \in \Phi_-(B)$. Since $\lambda \notin \sigma(M_C)$ implies $A - \lambda$ is left invertible and $B - \lambda$ is right invertible, A^* has SVEP at $\lambda \in \Phi_+(A)$ if and only if $A - \lambda$ is onto and B has SVEP at $\lambda \in \Phi_-(B)$ if and only if $B - \lambda$ is injective [1, Corollary 2.4]. In either case, both $A - \lambda$ and $B - \lambda$ are invertible, which implies that $\lambda \notin \sigma(M_0) \implies \sigma(M_0) \subseteq \sigma(M_C)$. Since $\sigma(M_C) \subseteq \sigma(M_0)$, the equality of the spectra follows.

Corollary 3.3 (a) [4, Proposition 4.1] If $\{\Xi(A) \cap \Xi(B^*)\} \cup \Xi(A^*) = \emptyset$, then M_0 satisfies Bt (resp., $a - Bt$) implies M_C satisfies Bt (resp., $a - Bt$).

(b) [2, Theorem 3.2] If either $\sigma_{aw}(A) = \sigma_{SF_+}(B)$ or $\sigma_{SF_-}(A) \cap \sigma_{SF_+}(B) = \emptyset$, then M_0 satisfies Bt (resp., $a - Bt$) implies M_C satisfies Bt (resp., $a - Bt$).

Proof. Observe that if $\{\Xi(A) \cap \Xi(B^*)\} \cup \Xi(A^*) = \emptyset$, then either A and A^* have SVEP or A^* and B^* have SVEP. Hence the proof for (a) follows from Theorem 3.1(b). Assume now that $\sigma_{aw}(A) = \sigma_{SF_+}(B)$. If $\lambda \notin \sigma_{aw}(M_C)$, then $\lambda \in \Phi_+(A)$ and either $\alpha(B - \lambda) < \infty$ and $\text{ind}(A - \lambda) + \text{ind}(B - \lambda) \leq 0$, or $\beta(A - \lambda) = \alpha(B - \lambda) = \infty$ and $(B - \lambda)\mathcal{X}$ is closed, or $\beta(A - \lambda) = \infty$ and $(B - \lambda)\mathcal{X}$ is not closed. Observe that if $\alpha(B - \lambda) = \beta(A - \lambda) = \infty$ or $\beta(A - \lambda) = \infty$, then the hypothesis $\lambda \in \Phi_+(A)$ with $\text{ind}(A - \lambda) \leq 0 \iff \lambda \in \Phi_+(B) \implies \alpha(B - \lambda) < \infty$ – a contradiction. Hence $\lambda \in \Phi_+(A) \cap \Phi_+(B)$ and $\text{ind}(A - \lambda) + \text{ind}(B - \lambda) \leq 0$. Again, if $\sigma_{SF_-}(A) \cap \sigma_{SF_+}(B) = \emptyset$, then $\Phi_-(A) \cup \Phi_+(B) = \mathbb{C}$. If $\lambda \notin \sigma_{aw}(M_C)$, then $\lambda \in \Phi_+(A) \implies \lambda \in \Phi(A)$, which (see above) implies that $\lambda \in \Phi_+(A) \cap \Phi_+(B)$ and $\text{ind}(A - \lambda) + \text{ind}(B - \lambda) \leq 0$. Hence if either of the hypotheses $\sigma_{aw}(A) = \sigma_{SF_+}(B)$ and $\sigma_{SF_-}(A) \cap \sigma_{SF_+}(B) = \emptyset$ holds, then $\sigma_{aw}(M_C) = \sigma_{aw}(M_0)$. A similar argument, this time using the fact that $\lambda \notin \sigma_w(M_C) \implies \lambda \notin \sigma_{aw}(M_C) = \sigma_{aw}(M_0)$, shows that $\sigma_w(M_C) = \sigma_w(M_0)$. (See [2, Corollary 2.2 and Theorem 3.2] for a slightly different argument.) Thus if M_0 satisfies Bt (resp., $a - Bt$), then M_C has SVEP at $\lambda \notin \sigma_w(M_C)$ (resp., $\lambda \notin \sigma_{aw}(M_C)$), which implies that M_C satisfies Bt (resp., $a - Bt$). $\square$

Remark 3.4 *If $\Xi(A^*) \cup \Xi(B^*) = \emptyset$, then M_C^* has SVEP: this follows from a straightforward application of the definition of SVEP (applied to $(M_C^* - \lambda I^*)(f_1(\lambda) \oplus f_2(\lambda)) = 0$). Hence $\sigma(M_0) = \sigma(M_C) = \sigma_a(M_C)$, $\sigma_{aw}(M_C) = \sigma_w(M_C) = \sigma_w(M_0)$ and $p_0(M_C) = p_0^a(M_C)$. Evidently, both M_0 and M_C satisfy $a - Bt$.*

We call an operator $T \in B(\mathcal{Y})$ *polaroid* [7] (resp., *isoloid*) at $\lambda \in \text{iso}\sigma(T)$ if $\text{asc}(T - \lambda) = \text{dsc}(T - \lambda) < \infty$ (resp., λ is an eigenvalue of T). Trivially, T polaroid at λ implies T isoloid at λ . Since

$$\pi_0(M_0) = \{\pi_0(A) \cap \rho(B)\} \cup \{\rho(A) \cap \pi_0(B)\} \cup \{\pi_0(A) \cap \pi_0(B)\},$$

if M_0 is polaroid at $\lambda \in \pi_0(M_0)$, then either A or B is polaroid at λ ; in particular, A and B are polaroid at $\lambda \in \pi_0(A) \cap \pi_0(B)$. Conversely, if A is polaroid at $\lambda \in \pi_0(A)$ and B is polaroid at $\mu \in \pi_0(B)$, then M_0 is polaroid at $\nu \in \pi_0(M_0)$. We say that T is a -polaroid if T is polaroid at $\lambda \in \text{iso}\sigma_a(T)$.

Proposition 3.5 (i) M_0 satisfies Wt if and only if M_0 has SVEP at $\lambda \notin \sigma_w(M_0)$ and M_0 is polaroid at $\mu \in \pi_0(M_0)$.

(ii) M_0 satisfies $a - Wt$ if and only if M_0 has SVEP at $\lambda \notin \sigma_{aw}(M_0)$ and M_0 is polaroid at $\mu \in \pi_0^a(M_0)$.

Proof. (i) is proved in [6, Theorem 2.2(i) and (ii)]. To prove (ii) we start by observing that if M_0 has SVEP at $\lambda \notin \sigma_{aw}(M_0)$, then $(M_0 \text{ satisfies } a - Bt \implies) \sigma_a(M_0) \setminus \sigma_{aw}(M_0) = p_0^a(M_0) \subseteq \pi_0^a(M_0)$, which if points in $\pi_0^a(M_0)$ are poles implies that $\pi_0^a(M_0) \subseteq p_0^a(M_0)$. Conversely, M_0 satisfies $a - Wt$ implies M_0 satisfies $a - Bt$, which in turn implies that M_0 has SVEP at $\lambda \notin \sigma_{aw}(M_0)$. Again, since M_0 (satisfies $a - Bt$ and) $a - Wt$, $\pi_0^a(M_0) = p_0^a(M_0)$. $\square$

A similar argument proves the following:

Proposition 3.6 (i) M_C satisfies Wt if and only if M_C has SVEP at $\lambda \notin \sigma_w(M_C)$ and M_C is polaroid at $\mu \in \pi_0(M_C)$.

(ii) M_C satisfies $a - Wt$ if and only if M_C has SVEP at $\lambda \notin \sigma_{aw}(M_C)$ and M_C is polaroid at $\mu \in \pi_0^a(M_C)$.

The following theorem gives a necessary and sufficient condition for M_C to satisfy Wt in the case in which either of the hypotheses (i), (ii) and (iii) of Theorem 3.1 is satisfied.

Theorem 3.7 If either of the SVEP hypotheses (i), (ii) and (iii) of Theorem 3.1(a) is satisfied, then M_C satisfies Wt for every $C \in B(\mathcal{X})$ if and only if M_0 satisfies Wt and A is polaroid at $\lambda \in \pi_0(M_C)$.

Proof. Sufficiency. If M_0 satisfies Wt (hence, Bt) and either of the hypotheses (i), (ii) and (iii) of Theorem 3.1 is satisfied, then A satisfies Bt , $\sigma(M_C) = \sigma(M_0)$, $\sigma_w(M_C) = \sigma_w(M_0)$ and M_C satisfies Bt (see Remark 3.2 and Theorem 3.1(a)). Hence

$$\sigma(M_C) \setminus \sigma_w(M_C) = \sigma(M_0) \setminus \sigma_w(M_0) = p_0(M_0) = \pi_0(M_0) \subseteq \pi_0(M_C),$$

where the final inclusion follows from the fact that $\sigma(M_C) \setminus \sigma_w(M_C) = p_0(M_C) \subseteq \pi_0(M_C)$. Hence to prove sufficiency, we have to prove the reverse inclusion. Let $\lambda \in \pi_0(M_C)$. Then $\lambda \in \text{iso}\sigma(M_0)$. Start by observing that $(M_C - \lambda)^{-1}(0) \neq \emptyset \implies (M_0 - \lambda)^{-1}(0) \neq \emptyset$; also, $\dim(M_C - \lambda)^{-1}(0) < \infty \implies \dim(A - \lambda)^{-1}(0) < \infty$. We claim that $\dim(B - \lambda)^{-1}(0) < \infty$. For suppose to the contrary that $\dim(B - \lambda)^{-1}(0)$ is infinite. Since

$$(M_C - \lambda)(x \oplus y) = \{(A - \lambda)x + Cy\} \oplus (B - \lambda)y,$$

either $\dim(C(B - \lambda)^{-1}(0)) < \infty$ or $\dim(C(B - \lambda)^{-1}(0)) = \infty$. If $\dim(C(B - \lambda)^{-1}(0)) < \infty$, then $(B - \lambda)^{-1}(0)$ contains an orthonormal sequence $\{y_j\}$ such that $(M_C - \lambda)(0 \oplus y_j) = 0$ for all $j = 1, 2, \dots$. But then $\dim(M_C - \lambda)^{-1}(0) = \infty$, a contradiction. Assume now that $\dim(C(B - \lambda)^{-1}(0)) = \infty$. Since $\lambda \in \rho(A) \cup \text{iso}\sigma(A)$, A satisfies Bt , A is polaroid at $\lambda \in \pi_0(M_C)$ and $\alpha(A - \lambda) < \infty$, $\beta(A - \lambda) < \infty$. Hence $\dim\{C(B - \lambda)^{-1}(0) \cap (A - \lambda)\mathcal{X}\} = \infty$ implies the existence of a sequence $\{x_j\}$ such that $(A - \lambda)x_j = Cy_j$ for all $j = 1, 2, \dots$. But then $(M_C - \lambda)(x_j \oplus -y_j) = 0$ for all $j = 1, 2, \dots$. Thus $\dim(M_C - \lambda)^{-1}(0) = \infty$, again a contradiction. Our claim having been proved, we conclude that $\lambda \in \pi_0(M_0)$. Thus $\pi_0(M_C) \subseteq \pi_0(M_0)$.

Necessity. Evidently, M_C satisfies Wt for all C implies M_0 satisfies Wt . Hence $p_0(M_C) = \pi_0(M_C) = p_0(M_0) = \pi_0(M_0)$, which implies that M_0 is polaroid at points $\lambda \in \pi_0(M_C)$. Since $\pi_0(M_C) = p_0(M_0)$, and since $\lambda \in p_0(M_0)$ implies $\lambda \in p_0(A) \cup \rho(A)$, A is polaroid at $\lambda \in \pi_0(M_C)$. $\square$

Remark 3.8 An examination of the proof of the sufficiency part of the theorem above shows that if either of the SVEP hypotheses (i), (ii) and (iii) of Theorem 3.1(a) is

satisfied and M_0 satisfies Wt , then either of the hypotheses that A is polaroid or A is isoloid and satisfies Wt is sufficient for M_C to satisfy Wt .

Corollary 3.9 (a) [4, Theorem 4.2] If $\{\Xi(A) \cap \Xi(B^*)\} \cup \Xi(A^*) = \emptyset$, A is polaroid at $\lambda \in \pi_0(M_C)$ (or A is isoloid and satisfies Wt) and M_0 satisfies Wt , then M_C satisfies Wt .

(b) [2, Theorem 3.3] If $\sigma_{aw}(A) = \sigma_{SF_+}(B)$ or $\sigma_{SF_-}(A) \cap \sigma_{SF_+}(B) = \emptyset$, A is polaroid at $\lambda \in \pi_0(M_C)$ (or A is isoloid and satisfies Wt) and M_0 satisfies Wt , then M_C satisfies Wt .

Proof. (a) Theorem 3.7, and Remark 3.8, apply.

(b) Recall, 3.3(b), that M_C satisfies $Bt \iff \sigma(M_C) \setminus \sigma_w(M_C) = p_0(M_C)$. Hence $\sigma(M_C) \setminus \sigma_w(M_C) \subseteq \pi_0(M_C)$. For the reverse inequality, start by recalling from the proof of Corollary 3.3(b) that $\sigma_w(M_C) = \sigma_w(M_0)$. If $\lambda_0 \in \pi_0(M_C)$, then there exists an ϵ -neighbourhood $\mathcal{N}_\epsilon$ of λ_0 such that $M_C - \lambda$ is invertible (implies $A - \lambda$ is left invertible and $B - \lambda$ is right invertible), hence Weyl, for all $\lambda \in \mathcal{N}_\epsilon$ not equal to λ_0 . Thus $M_0 - \lambda$ is Weyl for all $\lambda \in \mathcal{N}_\epsilon$ not equal to λ_0 . Since M_0 satisfies Bt , $M_0 - \lambda$ is Browder for all $\lambda \in \mathcal{N}_\epsilon$ not equal to λ_0 , which implies that both $A - \lambda$ and $B - \lambda$ are invertible. Hence $\lambda \in \text{iso}\sigma(M_0)$. Now argue as in the sufficiency part of the proof of Theorem 3.7. $\square$

The following examples, [8] and [4], show that M_C in theorem above may fail to satisfy Wt if one assumes only that A is isoloid but not polaroid at $\lambda \in \pi_0(M_C)$, or only that A is polaroid at $\lambda \in \pi_0(A)$.

Example 3.10 Let A, B and $C \in B(\ell^2)$ be the operators

$$\begin{aligned} A(x_1, x_2, x_3, \dots) &= (0, x_1, 0, \frac{1}{2}x_2, 0, \frac{1}{3}x_3, \dots), \\ B(x_1, x_2, x_3, \dots) &= (0, x_2, 0, x_4, 0, \dots), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$C(x_1, x_2, x_3, \dots) = (0, 0, x_2, 0, x_3, \dots).$$

Then A, A^*, B and B^* have SVEP, $\sigma(A) = \sigma_w(A) = \{0\}$, $\pi_0(A) = p_0(A) = \emptyset$, and A satisfies Weyl's theorem. Since $\sigma(M_0) = \sigma_w(M_0) = \{0, 1\}$ and $\pi_0(M_0) = p_0(M_0) = \emptyset$, M_0 satisfies Wt . However, since $\sigma(M_C) = \sigma_w(M_C) = \{0, 1\}$ and $\pi_0(M_C) = \{0\}$, M_C does not satisfy Wt . Observe that A is not polaroid on $\pi_0(M_C)$.

Again, let A, B and $C \in B(\ell^2)$ be the operators

$$\begin{aligned} A(x_1, x_2, x_3, \dots) &= (0, 0, 0, \frac{1}{2}x_2, 0, \frac{1}{3}x_3, \dots), \\ B(x_1, x_2, x_3, \dots) &= (0, x_2, 0, x_4, 0, \dots), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$C(x_1, x_2, x_3, \dots) = (x_1, 0, x_2, 0, x_3, \dots).$$

Then A , B (and C) have SVEP, $\sigma(A) = \sigma_w(A) = \pi_0(A) = \{0\}$, and $\sigma(B) = \sigma_w(B) = \{0, 1\}$, $\pi_0(B) = p_0(B) = \emptyset$. Since

$$\sigma(M_0) = \sigma_w(M_0) = \{0\} \text{ and } \pi_0(M_0) = p_0(M_0) = \emptyset,$$

M_0 satisfies Wt . However, since

$$\sigma(M_C) = \sigma_w(M_C) = \{0, 1\} \text{ and } \pi_0(M_C) = \{0\},$$

M_C does not satisfy Wt . Observe that $0 \notin p_0(A)$; A satisfies Bt , but does not satisfy Wt .

More can be said in the case in which $\Xi(A^*) \cup \Xi(B^*) = \emptyset$. Recall from Remark 3.4 that if $\Xi(A^*) \cup \Xi(B^*) = \emptyset$, then M_C^* has SVEP and M_C satisfies $a - Bt$.

Theorem 3.11 *If $\Xi(A^*) \cup \Xi(B^*) = \emptyset$, A is polaroid at $\lambda \in \pi_0^a(M_C)$ (or, A is isoloid and satisfies Wt) and B is polaroid at $\mu \in \pi_0^a(B)$, then M_C satisfies $a - Wt$.*

Proof. Since A^* and B^* have SVEP, both M_0^* and M_C^* have SVEP. Hence M_C (also, M_0) satisfies Bt , which implies that $\sigma(M_C) \setminus \sigma_w(M_C) = p_0(M_C) \subseteq \pi_0(M_C)$. Apparently, $\sigma(M_0) = \sigma(M_C) = \sigma_a(M_C)$, $\sigma_w(M_0) = \sigma_w(M_C) = \sigma_{aw}(M_C)$, $\pi_0(M_C) = \pi_0^a(M_C)$ and $\text{iso}\sigma(M_C) = \text{iso}\sigma(M_0)$. Following (part of) the argument of the proof of the sufficiency part of Theorem 3.7, it follows that if $\lambda \in \pi_0(M_C)$, then $\lambda \in \pi_0(A) \cap \pi_0(B)$. By assumption, both A and B are polaroid at λ . Hence M_0 is polaroid at λ , which implies that $\lambda \in p_0(M_0)$. Since M_0 satisfies Bt , $\lambda \notin \sigma_w(M_0) = \sigma_w(M_C)$, which in view of the fact that M_C satisfies Bt implies that $\lambda \in p_0(M_C)$. Hence $\sigma(M_C) \setminus \sigma_w(M_C) = \pi_0(M_C) \implies \sigma_a(M_C) \setminus \sigma_{aw}(M_C) = \pi_0^a(M_C)$, i.e., M_C satisfies $a - Wt$. $\square$

Theorem 3.11 holds for polaroid operators A and B : for the polaroid hypothesis implies that M_0 is polaroid, hence satisfies Wt , which by Theorem 3.7 implies that M_C satisfies Wt . If the operators A and B have SVEP, then M_0 and M_C have SVEP, $\sigma(M_0) = \sigma(M_C) = \sigma(M_C^*) = \sigma_a(M_C^*)$, $\text{iso}\sigma(M_0^*) = \text{iso}\sigma(M_C^*) = \text{iso}\sigma_a(M_C^*)$, $\pi_0(M_C^*) = \pi_0^a(M_C^*)$ and $\sigma_w(M_0) = \sigma_w(M_C) = \sigma_w(M_C^*) = \sigma_{aw}(M_C^*)$. Evidently, A^* , B^* , M_0^* and M_C^* satisfy Bt ; in particular, $p_0(M_0^*) = p_0(M_C^*) \subseteq \pi_0(M_C^*)$.

Corollary 3.12 *If the polaroid operators A and B have SVEP, then M_C satisfies Wt and M_C^* satisfies $a - Wt$.*

Proof. Apparently, M_C satisfies Wt . Since the polaroid hypothesis on A and B implies that A^* and B^* are polaroid, an argument similar to that in the theorem above applied to M_C^* implies that if $\lambda \in \pi_0(M_C^*)$, then $\lambda \in \pi_0(B^*) \cap \pi_0(A^*) \implies \lambda \in p_0(B^*) \cap p_0(A^*) \implies \lambda \notin \sigma_w(M_0^*) = \sigma_w(M_C^*) \implies M_C^*$ satisfies Wt . Hence M_C^* satisfies $a - Wt$. $\square$

References

- [1] Pietro Aiena, *Fredholm and Local Spectral Theory with Applications to Multipliers*, Kluwer, 2004.
- [2] Xiaohong Cao and Bin Meng, *Essential approximate point spectra and Weyl's theorem for operator matrices*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. **304**(2005)759-771.
- [3] Dragan Djordjević, *Perturbation of spectra of operator matrices*, J. Oper. Th. **48**(2002)467-486.
- [4] Slavisa V. Djordjević and Hassan Zguitti, *Essential point spectra of operator matrices through local spectral theory*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. **338** (2008), 285-291.
- [5] B.P. Duggal, *Hereditarily normaloid operators*, Extracta Math. **20**(2005)203-217.
- [6] B. P. Duggal, *Polaroid operators satisfying Weyl's theorem*, Lin. Alg. Appl. **414**(2006)271-277.
- [7] B. P. Duggal, R. E. Harte and I. H. Jeon, *Polaroid operators and Weyl's theorem*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **132**(2004)1345-1349.
- [8] Woo Young Lee, *Weyl's theorem for operator matrices*, Integr. Equat. Op. Th. **32**(1998)319-331

8 Redwood Grove
 Ealing
 London W5 4SZ
 United Kingdom

email: bpduggal@yahoo.co.uk